REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-18, and 23-38 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-18, 23, and 26-28 have been amended and new claims 29-38 have been added.

Summary of Interview

Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for his time and participation in the telephone interview on March 4, 2004. During the interview, which was attended by Tim Bliss and Examiner Stephan Willett, all claims were discussed, with particular focus on claim 1 as an example. The discussion included elements of the claims which the Examiner found to be unclear, as well as suggestions on improving the claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his suggestions and has amended the claims to address the concerns identified in the interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 11, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 11, and 15 have been amended to overcome the rejections. It is understood that these amendments simply clarify elements that were already present in the claims, and so are not amendments that would raise any estoppel.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-18, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,510 to O'Conner et al. ("O'Conner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,953 to Chang et al. ("Chang").

MPEP § 2143 requires that "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Further, under MPEP § 2142, "[i]f the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness." It is submitted that the Office action fails to factually support a prima facie case of obviousness based on O'Conner and Chang for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, 15, and 23

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part: "delegating one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity; and accessing the resource, by the software entity, using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention of the principal to authenticate access requests by the software entity, wherein tasks can be accomplished by the software entity without control by the principal." (emphasis added)

The cited text of O'Conner and Chang fails to teach or suggest the highlighted elements. For example, O'Conner recites:

> At step 214, the host acts on the user's instructions. These instructions may include, but are not limited to, indicating what information the user wishes the host to retrieve, what services (e.g., gaming services) the user wants the host to provide, or what information the user wants the host to store or otherwise process. (col. 11, lines 18-24) (emphasis added)

Therefore, O'Conner simply discloses that the host acts on the user's instructions. It does not describe the delegation of rights to enable a software entity to access a resource using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention or control by the principal. Chang fails to remedy this deficiency of O'Conner. Accordingly, O'Conner and Chang, whether taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 1 as required by MPEP § 2143. As a result, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 11, 15, and 23

Claim 11, as amended, recites in part means for providing, to the principal, a deputization certificate adapted for enabling the principle to copy one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity.

Claim 15, as amended, recites in part forwarding, to the principal, a deputization credential empowering the principal to deputize software entities; and deputizing, by the principal, at least one of the software entities, wherein the software entity can exercise one or more of the principal's access rights due to the deputization.

Claim 23, as amended, provides the principal with deputizing authority at the identified access authorization level, wherein the deputizing authority comprises a deputization credential that enables the principal to give at least one software entity within the computer system a level

of resource access permission equal to or lesser than the principal's resource access permissions.

The cited text of O'Conner and Chang fails to teach or suggest the above recited elements as required by MPEP § 2143. Accordingly, claims 11, 15, and 23 are deemed allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-7, 10, 12-14, 16-18, and 24-28 depend from and further limit one of claims 1, 11, 15 and 23, and should also be allowed.

New claims

New independent claim 29 and dependent claims 30-38 were drafted in response to the Examiner's comments in the previously described Examiner interview. Applicant submits that the new claims address the Examiner's comments and more clearly distinguish the present invention over the cited references.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims in the application are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy F. Bliss
Registration No. 50,925

Dated: March 15, 2004
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8638
Facsimile: 972/692-9101
File: 26530.4

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 15, 2004.

Gayle Conner